



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/670,121	09/25/2003	Massimo Giannozzi	3816-52	2558
23117	7590	03/09/2005	EXAMINER	
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC			KOEHLER, ROBERT R	
1100 N GLEBE ROAD			ART UNIT	
8TH FLOOR			PAPER NUMBER	
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-4714			1775	

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/670,121

Applicant(s)

GIANNOZZI, MASSIMO

Examiner

Robert R. Koehler

Art Unit

1775

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on September 25, 2003 (Prel. Amdt.).
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 16-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 12-15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

RRK.
3-5-05

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

15

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: In claim 2, the subject matter of "said composition also comprises from 0.01 to 1% by weight of iron and/or 0.01 to 1% by weight of manganese" cannot be found in the specification. See line 19 on page 8 to line 7 on page 9.

2. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: In claim 7, the subject matter of "the layer of coating applied has a thickness ranging from 0.1 to 5 mm" cannot be found in the specification. See lines 15 to 17 on page 14.

Claim Objections

Claims 12 and 14 are objected to because of the following informalities: Each of claims 12 and 14 contains a table that lists a specific cobalt-base alloy composition. Near the bottom of each table, the claim page number (i.e., "-4-" or "-5-") can be found within the box labelled as "Balance." The Examiner respectfully suggests that these numerals be removed from both of the tables and placed below the alloy composition tables. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 1775

Claim 19 recites the limitation "said anti-erosion surface lining" in line 2 of the claim.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1 to 4, 7, 10, 11, and 16 to 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Japan Patent Application No. 11-336502 (Japan '502).

Japan '502 discloses a method of providing an improved anti-wear contact surface for moving turbine blades by welding a contact surface onto the appropriate regions of a turbine blade. The welded contact surface can have a thickness of approximately 1 mm; see page 2 of the computer translation of the "Detailed Description." According to the computer translation of the "Detailed Description" and the English-language translation of the abstract (Derwent), Japan '502 discloses cobalt-base alloy compositions having the same alloying elements (Cr, W, Fe, Mo, Ni, C, Si, and Mn) as claimed by the applicant with alloy elemental ranges that either overlap or meet (touch) applicant's claimed alloy elemental ranges. The Examiner notes that the alloy ranges for tungsten, nickel, and molybdenum in Japan '502 meet (touch) the respective alloy elemental ranges being claimed by the applicant. Prior art which teaches a range within, overlapping, or touching the claimed range anticipates if the prior art range discloses the claimed range with sufficient specificity. See MPEP 2131.03 and *Ex parte Lee*, 31 USPQ2d 1105 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993).

2. Claims 10, 11, and 16 to 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by "Material Safety Data Sheet - Stellite Tips" (6 sheets).

Art Unit: 1775

The "Material Safety Data Sheet - Stellite Tips" (MSDS - Stellite) contains extensive information about cobalt-base alloys including alloy compositions under the trade name "Stellite." The MSDS - Stellite discloses cobalt-base alloy compositions having the same alloying elements (C, Co, Cr, Fe, Mn, Mo, Ni, Si, and W) as claimed by the applicant with alloy elemental range limits that overlap or meet (touch) applicant's claimed alloy elemental ranges. See Section 2, "Percentage of Hazardous Ingredients In Various Alloys", on pages 1 and 2 of the MSDS - Stellite publication. Prior art which teaches a range within, overlapping, or touching the claimed range anticipates if the prior art range discloses the claimed range with sufficient specificity. See MPEP 2131.03 and *Ex parte Lee*, 31 USPQ2d 1105 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1 to 11 and 16 to 19 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 to 9 and 15 to 18 of copending Application No. 10/697,973 (Giannozzi). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims are directed to a method for the treatment of organs subject to erosion by liquids comprising the application of a cobalt-base alloy on the surface of the organ to form an anti-erosion layer wherein the claimed cobalt-base alloy compositions have identical alloying elements (Cr, W, Si, C, Ni, Fe, Mn, Mo, and Co) with alloy elemental range limits that overlap or meet (touch).

Art Unit: 1775

Although both sets of claims do not contain identical alloy elemental ranges for the claimed cobalt-base alloy compositions, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art of cobalt-base alloys and cobalt-base metal coatings to select those portions of the alloy elemental ranges that overlap or meet (touch) and arrive at the same cobalt-base alloys or cobalt-base coating compositions which are utilized in the claimed method. A skilled person would have been motivated to rely on the claimed subject matter contained in Serial No. 10/697,973 and arrive at applicant's claimed method and claimed cobalt-base alloy compositions because the '973 patent application claims are directed toward the same method of coating a metallic substrate with a cobalt-base alloy and the same cobalt-base alloy compositions.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 12 to 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The Examiner believes that the prior art does not teach, suggest, or disclose applicant's claimed cobalt-base alloy compositions which contain specific amounts of Cr, W, Si, C, Ni, Fe, Mn, Mo, and Co. These specific cobalt-base alloys contain at least one alloying element having a concentration value that clearly lies outside of the alloy elemental ranges taught by the cited prior art.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Robert Koehler whose telephone number is (571) 272-1536.

Art Unit: 1775

The Examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday to Friday from 9:30 AM to 7:00 PM. The Examiner can also be reached on alternate Mondays.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Deborah Jones, can be reached on **(571) 272-1535**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **703-872-9306**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866-217-9197** (toll-free).



ROBERT R. KOEHLER
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit 1775
March 5, 2005